UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,363	03/16/2006	Christian Helmut Thoma	3006-1008-2 US	8843
466 Voling & Th	7590 03/06/2007 & THOMPSON EXAMINER			
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202			BOLES, DEREK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
*			3749	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/563,363	THOMA				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Derek S. Boles	3749				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	:	•				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 J	anuary 2006					
•						
,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1,6-8,11,17-21,25 and 27-34</u> is/are re		·				
7) Claim(s) 2-5,9,10,12-16,22-24 and 26 is/are o						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 January 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
.11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
		·				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/4/06.	6) Other:	гасен Аррисанон				
S Patent and Trademark Office						

Application/Control Number: 10/563,363

Art Unit: 3749

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 6-8, 17, 19, 20, 25 and 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujiwara et al. (6,250,561). See figs 1-3, 1 for the housing, 3 for the chamber, 20 for the rotor, 24 for interior passageways with inlet and 25 for the circumferential rows.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, see col. 5, lines 40-54. Regarding claims 8 and 28, see col. 5, lines 29-39. Regarding claim 11, see 5 and 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Regarding claim 18, Fujiwara et al. discloses all of the limitations of the claim except for the rows being spaced at variable intervals. However, since the applicant has failed to establish any criticality or synergistic results which are derived from the recited configurations, these limitations are considered a matter of obvious design choice. Thus, the applicant's design configurations would have been an obvious improvement to one of ordinary skill in the art with regard to the apparatus disclosed in Fujiwara et al.

Art Unit: 3749

Regarding claim 21, Fujiwara et al. discloses all of the limitations of the claim except for the depth of the hole exceeding in distance to a greater dimension than the radius dimension of the rotor. However, since the applicant has failed to establish any criticality or synergistic results which are derived from the recited configurations, these limitations are considered a matter of obvious design choice. Thus, the applicant's design configurations would have been an obvious improvement to one of ordinary skill in the art with regard to the apparatus disclosed in Fujiwara et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-5, 9, 10, 12-16, 22-24 and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The provided references are representative of the state of the art that is applicable to the applicant's invention. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Derek S. Boles at (571) 272-4872 or supervisory patent examiner Kenneth Rinehart at (571) 272-4881.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-919 Titled free).

D.S.B.

PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3700

3/5/07